DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 908 PS 013 920

AUTHOR Oakes, Ruth; Quina, Katherine
TITLE The Impact of Gender and Role Perspective on Moral Judgment.
PUB DATE 7 May 83
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association (55th, Chicago, IL, May 5-7, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Ability; Cognitive Development; *Elementary School Students; Grade 3; *Identification (Psychology); *Moral Values; *Perspective Taking; Primary Education; *Sex Differences; Sex Role; *Value Judgment

ABSTRACT

A study was made of the effects of role perspective and gender on the moral judgments of children. Because they represent a transitional period in cognitive development from heteronomy to autonomy, a total of 25 male and 38 female third-grade students of approximately 9 years of age were selected for participation. The effect of perspective taking on moral judgment was measured by having subjects make judgments from their own perspectives as well as from the perspectives of their mothers and fathers. Since the literature indicates that moral judgment is influenced by sex-role identification and parent identification, measures were included to assess these dimensions. The major concern, however, was the examination of sex differences in moral reasoning. Each subject was given a series of three tests presented in random order: the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test, Piaget's Moral Maturity Scale, and the Parent Identification Scale (a 23-item scale designed for the study and including questions about the child's favorite toys and best friends, the mother's and father's favorite items, and selected parent behaviors and characteristics). Results yielded no significant effect for gender on moral judgment at this age level. The effect of perspective on moral reasoning yielded significant results, with the highest moral judgment scores being obtained from the child's perspective. (Author/RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235908

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE IMPACT OF GENDER AND ROLE PERSPECTIVE ON MORAL JUDGMENT

By

Ruth Oakes, Ph.D.
Saint Mary on the Mount Hospital/
Rehabilitation Center
9101 South Broadway
Saint Louis, Missouri 63125
(314) 631-7800

and

Katherine Quina, Ph.D.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ruth Oakes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 013920

Paper presented at poster session at the Midwest Psychological Association, Chicago, IL., May 7, 1983.

THE IMPACT OF GENDER AND ROLE PERSPECTIVE ON MORAL JUDGMENT

By R. Oakes and K. Quina

Abstract:

The focus of this study is the effect of role perspective and gender on moral judgment in children. Role taking experience has been demonstrated as fundamental for moral maturity. Since gender - linked socialization experiences appear to define and limit the role-taking opportunities for males and females, it is important to investigate the association between gender and moral judgment in a population making the transition from an egocentric role perspective to a reciprocal role-taking perspective. This is especially significant since investigators report different levels of moral maturity in adults as a function of gender.

Third graders were selected for this study because they represent a transition period in both role-taking ability and moral judgment stages. The subjects were 25 males and 30 females in two classes of urban midwestern schools randomly assigned by the director of educational research.

The results yielded no significant effect for gender on moral judgment at this age level. However, the effect of perspective on moral reasoning yielded significant results with the highest moral judgment scores from the child's perspective.

THE IMPACT OF GENDER AND ROLE PERSPECTIVE ON MORAL JUDGMENT

Moral judgment in children has been the focus of a considerable amount of research. Experimenters have concentrated primarily on clarifying and/or supporting theoretical models to account for the child's increasing sophistication in making moral judgments. The cognitive developmentalists present developmental correlations between specific levels of moral judgment and cognitive stages to support their view that cognitive development is the primary determinant in moral development.

Jean Piaget (1965) was one of the first researchers to explore moral development, and continues to be an influential force. Using a "clinical interview" technique, Piaget identified a series of qualitatively different stages of cognitive development, through which all children progress in an invariant order. The perspective unique to each developmental stage strongly influences the child's perception of external social influences. In other words, the child's developmental level structures his experience. An identical situation may be experienced differently by two children at different stages of development. Social and cultural factors may speed up, slow down, or stop development, but they cannot change stage sequence.

Piaget subsequently related his cognitive developmental theory to the development of moral reasoning. He devised a moral judgment

interview consisting of pairs of stories depicting a good intention/high negative consequence situation versus a bad intention/low consequence situation. Following the presentation of the two situations, he posed a series of questions to each child to enable him to observe their moral reasoning processes.

Through this technique, Piaget identified two major stages in moral development. He labelled the earlier developmental stage heteronomy, or a morality of constraint. This early stage appears to be the product of cognitive immaturity in conjunction with unilateral respect of adults. The child's egocentric perspective prevents him/her from assuming the viewpoint of others in social situations. Children at this stage concentrate primarily on the physical consequences of an act, and they believe punishment is both inevitable and arbitrary. At this early stage, rules are externalized and treated as immutable absolutes.

The more advanced developmental stage identified by Piaget is autonomy, which is characterized by cooperation, reciprocity and mutual respect. At this stage, the child is able to assume the perspective of others and operates with more flexibility. The child is now able to focus on intention rather than physical consequences of an act. The belief in arbitrary punishment characteristic of heteronomy gives way to a belief in restitution or reciprocal penalties.

Piaget observed that heteronomy and autonomy appear to be overlapping thought processes, with heteronomy predominating in

the child's early years. Somewhere after the age of eight or nine, heteronomy is succeeded by the higher level of cooperative morality, autonomy.

According to Piaget, this transition from heteronomy to autonomy is facilitated by role-taking experiences in peer situations. The mutual respect and equality characteristic of these exchanges leads away from a morality based on the will of authority to a morality built on flexible rules which are designed to enhance common rights and obligations among equals.

Kohlberg (1969), proceeding from a cognitive-developmental approach, identified six qualitatively different stages of moral reasoning. He divided the six stages into three levels of two stages each. Each level represents an advance over the previous level, and the higher stage at each level represents more advanced moral reasoning than the lower numbered stage. The first level, the Preconventional level, includes Stages One and Two. Stage One individuals respond from a punishment and obedience orientation. For these individuals, the goodness or badness of an act is determined primarily by the physical consequences. Stage Two individuals base their judgments on the satisfaction of their needs. The next level, the Conventional level, is divided into Stages Three and Four. Stage Three individuals reason primarily from the perspective of societal law and order. Kohlberg's highest level, the Postconventional, Autonomous, or Principled

level, is characterized by the social contract-legalistic orientation (Stage Five) and the use of universal ethical principles (Stage Six).

For Kohlberg as for Piaget, the key to progression through these stages is role playing experiences in peer situations, leading to reciprocal perspective-taking. Progression through these six developmental stages is invariant, with advancement being effected through the resolution of cognitive disequilibrium.

Piaget and Kohlberg both concentrated their research on male subjects. For Piaget, this focus was due to his puzzlement over the sex differences he observed in the course of his experiments. He found that his female subjects appeared to have a less developed legal sense than his male subjects, and in a physical aggression situation, females tended to repay fewer blows than they received while males in the same situation tended to repay more blows. Piaget did not discuss the origins of these sex differences. Instead, he directed his attention to the moral development of male subjects.

Kohlberg's early research included only males, so that the standardization of his moral maturity scale and his theoretical position are based on the responses of males. He has cited wider variability in the responses of females as the reason for their exclusion (note 1). In addition, the protagonist in his test stories is usually a male while the victim is typically a female,

child, or sick male. This potential scale sex bias is rarely considered in research by other investigators using Kohlberg's system.

In fact, using Kohlberg's stories with both male and female subjects, some researchers have reported that males function at a higher level of moral reasoning. A study by Poppen (1974), using Kohlberg's moral maturity scale, suggested that adult females average Stage Three, orienting towards conformity in social roles and responsibilities, while males tend to reason at a higher Stage Four, utilizing a law and order orientation. A similar finding was reported by Holstein (1976). She found that females gave more emotional responses to Kohlberg's moral judgment studies, resulting in the categorization of females at a lower level than males.

Role-Taking Experiences

Given that role-taking experience is fundamental for moral judgment and maturity according to cognitive developmentalists, it is crucial to investigate the association between role-taking experiences and moral judgment to better understand these gender effects. Piaget observed that acquiring the reciprocal ability to take the perspective of another person is the key to autonomy, the highest level of moral reasoning in the cognitive developmental model. However, role playing experiences are closely linked to sex role identification. Sex-typed socialization processes appear to define and limit the role-taking opportunities for males and females.

Flavell (1968) defines role taking as the ability to understand the interaction between the self and others as seen through the eyes

of the other. He makes a distinciton between role enactment and role-taking. Role enactment involves the subject actually incorporating the role attributes of the other and behaving overtly in accordance with them. Role-taking is a covert, cognitive process of adopting the perspective or attitudes of another in order to understand the role. Role-taking can lead to behavioral changes by serving as a rehearsal for role enactment or providing understanding of the other's perspective.

Role taking requires the ability to assume perspective apart from the intrusion of one's own perspective. Studies indicate that this is a developmental ability (Flavell, 1968; Piaget, 1965; Selman, 1971). At about age 9, children progress from an egocentric role perspective to a reciprocal role-taking perspective. Selman (1971) found that egocentric role takers tend to use Preconventional moral reasoning while reciprocal role takers reasoned at the Conventional level. He concluded that reciprocal role-taking is a necessary but not sufficient condition for moral reasoning advancement.

Marsh and Serafico (1977) did a study that supports Selman's developmental model of perspective taking. They tested children from ages 4 to 10 on a social role-taking task, a spatial perspective task, and a moral reasoning task. They found that each ability increased with age, and that the abilities were significantly intercorrelated. They found that perspective had a significant impact

on moral reasoning at ages 5, 7, and 9, and concluded that perspective taking mediates moral judgment. This corresponds to Yussen's (1976) findings that adolescents and college students exhibit different levels of moral judgment using social perspecitves other than their own. For example, he reported fewer principled responses from students taking the perspective of policeman than from students taking the perspective of philosopher.

The profound impact of role perspective on the classification of moral judgment stages has also been demonstratec by Levine (1976). Using Kohlberg's moral judgment stories, he observed that the identity of the protagonist and the nature of the issue caused a fluctuation between Stage Three and Stage Four, with both stages used by each subject. This seems to indicate that Stage Four does not simply reflect a higher stage of moral reasoning as Kohlberg claims, but rather that movement between the Conventional level stages Three and Four is interchangeable depending on the role perspective of the subject.

Sex Role Identification

If, as it appears, role taking experiences are closely tied to sex role training, it is important to explore the process of sex role identification and the association between sex role identification and moral reasoning. Colley (1959) states that "persons do not exist, there are only male persons and female persons--biologically, sociologically, and psychologically." How does an

individual begin to associate with the category male or female? Brown (1958) distinguished between sex role preference and sex role identification. The former refers to behavior associated with one sex or the other that the individual would like to adopt or that is perceived as the preferred or more desirable behavior. Identification is the behavior associated with one sex or the other that the individual introjects and acquires as his or her own. By the second year of life, the child begins to distinguish between male and female and between masculine and feminine. Preference for a particular sex role begins to emerge by the third year.

According to cognitive developmental theory (Kohlberg, 1969), sex role identity coincides with the cognitive stage of conservation, around age 5. At that time, the child learns that his sex is a constant and then begins to acquire appropriate behaviors and values. This contrasts with the social learning theory claim that sex role identification and modeling or imitation represent the same process, and are the product of previously learned behaviors (Bandura, in Goslin, 1969). However, both approaches concentrate on the social influences related to learning appropriate sex-typed behaviors.

Research indicates that both sex role preference and sex role identification are more pronounced in males (Brown, 1958; Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg, 1963). Brown reported that boys in kindergarten through fourth grade showed a stronger preference for aspects of the masculine role than girls showed for the feminine role. A

majority of girls in grades one through four expressed a greater preference for masculine things than for feminine things. Brown explains these differences using the Freudian emphasis on anatomical differences, the Adlerian emphasis on sociocultural favoritism of the males, and the fact that the female has more lattitude in expressing a preference for sex-typed objects and activities in our society. Sutton-Smith and Rosenberg (1963) found that for boys, games and sports were positively associated with the male sex role, but girls' choices were more generalized.

How does this more concrete sense of identification found in boys relate to moral reasoning studies? Since male toys and activities tend to be more action-oriented, males would be expected to respond in an instrumental or action-related manner in moral reasoning situations. This action orientation should result in a more situation-specific or environmentally dependent orientation. Their strong sense of male identity would tend to lead them to identify more closely with male characters in moral judgment stories (Kohlberg, 1969), resulting in a straightforward action type of response.

The more general orientation of females should tend to make them more responsive to all perspectives in a moral situation. This response type would imply a more empathic or feeling oriented approach. Instead of the situational focus of males, females should tend to respond from a generalized "people" perspective.

Parent Identification

Parent identification has long been recognized as a significant factor in sex role identification and gender related role experiences (Freud, in Sprachey 1961; Sears, 1953). One of the most influential theories involving parent identification is that of Freud. He asserted that the differential identification processes he postulated for boys and girls lead to a stronger superego development in males, characterized by a greater internalization of moral prohibition and a more moralistic perspective than girls.

Johnson (1963) hypothesized that identification with the father is crucial for producing appropriate sex role orientation in both males and females. He claimed that the mother emphasizes feelings and personal adjustment and does not differentiate in her treatment of boys and girls. The female learns feminine ways by trying to be a woman who pleases her father, while the male acquires a more instrumental orientation by striving to be a man like his father. This corresponds to the male and female orientation discussed in the section on sex role identification.

Fry's (1975) results corresponded to the theories of Freud and Johnson emphasizing the essential nature of father identification for advanced moral reasoning in both male and female children. In his experiment measuring the relationship between moral judgment and parent identification in 9 and 11-year-olds, he reported that, for females as well as for males, the attainment of high moral

judgment is related more significantly to assumed identification with the father.

Weisbroth (1970) found that moral maturity in males was related to identification with both parents, but for females it was related more to identification with the father. Lazowick (1955) reported the same trend.

However, Sears, Maccoby and Levin (1957) reported earlier development of conscience in girls because of a smoother identification process with the mother. In the early years, both boys and girls identify primarily with the mother. Girls retain this initial maternal identification, but as a result of the defensive process of identification with the aggressor (A. Frued in Sears et al., 1957), boys shift to the father. Thus for boys, the identification conflict retards the development of conscience, while for girls, the continuity of identification accounts for an earlier development of inner control.

Lynn (1962) theorized that females identify with specific aspects of the mother's role as they observe them directly. Boys, on the other hand, are unable to observe the father's specific role behavior. Instead, they must identify with the cultural stereotype of what is masculine. He characterized his identification model as a case of the female learning the lesson (imitation) as opposed to males solving the problem. Lynn claims that these processes lead to a greater need for affiliation for the female

and greater problem solving skills for the male. This corresponds to the empathic orientation of females and the action orientation of males observed in moral development research.

Peck and Havinghurst (1960) found that the majority of females in their study seemed to acquire their moral perspective from their mothers. They reported that advanced moral judgment was related to the moral makeup of the child's model, rather than to whether they identify with the mother or father.

The present study was designed to investigate the association between gender and role perspective, and moral judgment. The effect of perspective taking on moral judgment was measured in the present study by having the children make judgments from their own perspective as well as from the perspective of their mother and their father. Since the literature indicates that moral judgment is influenced by sex role identification and parent identification, measures were included to assess these dimensions.

Third graders (around age 9) were selected for this research because this age group represents a transitional period in cognitive development. We would expect to find a greater variation in moral judgments at this age, as children move from heteronomy to autonomy. In addition, role taking skills are developing along with cognitive abilities, so these children should be capable of switching perspectives in order to make moral judgments from the viewpoints of thier mother and father.

The major concern was an examination of sex differences in moral reasoning. If they are not observed at this age, sex differences in parent identification and sex role identification will be explored in terms of their potential effect on moral judgment at a later period such as adolescence, after those identification processes have become stabilized.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 25 male and 38 female third graders in two urban midwestern schools. The schools were randomly assigned by the director of educational research in the public schools. All third grade students in both schools were tested.

Measures

Each subject was given a series of three tests presented in randomized order. These tests were as follows:

1. Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test (Harris, 1963): All three forms of this test were administered (Draw-A-Man, Draw-A-Woman, and Draw-A-Child). In the Draw-A-Child test, the word "child" was substituted for the word "yourself" in order to investigate the use of this scale as a measure of sex role identification.

The subject was always instructed to draw a child first; the order of the other two scales was randomized.

2. Piaget's Moral Maturity Scale (Piaget, 1965): Piaget's two sets of stories, intention/consequences and lying, were slightly altered to create three pairs of stories in each of the above two categories (consequences and lying), one set each of child (neutral) interacting with parents, a boy interacting with parents, and a girl interacting with parents.

The first moral judgment story presented to each subject was intent/consequences, "child" actor. The "boy" actor and "girl" actor intent/consequences stories followed in randomized order. The fourth story presented was the "child" lie story, followed by the "girl" and "boy" lie stories randomly presented. This procedure was utilized to control for (1) effect of boy/girl on personal answers and (2) responses due to a particular order of stories.

For each pair of stories in the six conditions, the experimenter first read the story and then asked the child to explain what happened in the story in order to assess the child's understanding. After both stories were presented, the experimenter asked the subject to identify the naughtiest of the two children in the stories. In order to avoid a response set of judgment based on poor recall, the order of the good intent/high consequences, bad intent/low consequences was alternated.

The second experimental condition using the moral judgment scale involved the effect of perspective taking on moral judgment. After the reading of each set of paired stories and the child's

selection of the naughtiest, the experimenter asked the child to pretend to be the mother. The subject then responded to the question, "Who does mother think was naughtiest?" The same procedure was repeated to assess moral reasoning from the father's perspective.

3. Parent Identification Scale (Oakes & Quina-Holland, 1977): The unavailability of a standardized scale made it necessary to design one for this study. The scale includes 23 questions. The first two asked the child to identify his favorite toys and best friends. Questions 3 through 18 ask for the mother's favorite item (pet, dessert, flower, etc.) and the father's favorite item (the same categories). The child was then asked to choose between the two responses for his/her favorite. Questions 19 through 23 concerned the selection of mother or father as the parent who punishes, makes the biggest decisions, is stronger, or smarter.

A positive score was recorded for each answer that matched the selection for mother; a negative score was recorded for each answer that matched the selection for father. Answers that did not match either selection (mother or father) were not counted.

Before administering the Parent Identification Scale, the experimenter verified that the father was presently living at home, had not been out of the home for more than 18 months to 2 years, or had ongoing contact with the child. If those conditions were not met, only the first two questions were presented.

Procedure

Two male and two female experimenters alternated testing male and female children. The tests were administered in an available room provided at each of the two schools. Due to a lack of facilities, all testing was done in the same room at each school. Each experimenter worked in a different area of the room.

The tests were presented in randomized order.

Results

Seven subjects for whom the Parent Identification Scale could not be completed were not included in the following analyses, leaving a total of 32 female and 24 male participants.

The primary focus of this study was the exploration of sex differences affecting moral reasoning. For this reason, the first analyses concentrated on determining differences between the sexes for all variables.

Goodenough-Harris Test.--All three scales (Draw-a-Man, Draw-a-Woman, Draw-a-Child) were scored according to the Goodenough-Harris manual (1963), with a total of 73 points possible for each scale. The point scores were transformed into IQ scores based on the Goodenough-Harris standardized tables. Mean IQs are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1

Mean IQ Scores for the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test

	Draw A Man	Draw a Woman	Draw a Child
Males	100	95.17	99.64
Females	92.47	90.56	91.65
Across Sex	95.70	92.54	96.98

A two-factor analysis of variance for sex of participant and type of scale yielded a significant main effect of sex (F (1,54) = 4.15, $p < .05$), with males scoring higher than females on all scales. Comparisons among the three scales also revealed a significant main effect (F (2, 108) = 4.32, $p < .025$. A Newman-Keuls comparison was performed on the across-sex scores on the Goodenough-Harris scales. This analysis, presented in Table 2, revealed that the Draw-a-Woman score was significantly lower than the Draw-a-Man or Draw-a-Child scores. The latter two scores did not differ from each other.

Insert Table 2 about here

While the interaction was not statistically significant ($p < .1$), it seems worthwhile to note that scores for females were relatively similar across the three IQ scales, while for males larger differences (especially the lower Draw-a-Woman score) were observed.

Parent Identification.--Father identification is indicated by a negative total score; mother identification corresponds to a positive total score. The univariate F ratio for the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors indicated a significant difference between sexes on this scale (F (2,108) = 12.92, $p < .0008$). The means were in the expected direction of same-sex parent identification (Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 2

Newman-Keuls Test

Goodenough-Harris IQ Scores Across Sex

	Draw A Woman 92.54	Draw A Man 95.70	Draw A Child 96.98
Draw A Woman 92.54		3.16*	4.44*
Draw A Man 95.70			1.28
Draw A Child 96.98			

*$p < .05$

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for the

Parent Identification Scale

	$\bar{X}$	S.D.
Males	-2.42	.52
Females	2.88	.56

Moral Judgment Scale.--The moral judgment score was determined by awarding one point for each choice based on good intention as opposed to physical consequence. There were three subscales, representing the perspectives of self, father, and mother, with a total of 6 possible points each. Scores are presented in Table 4.

Insert Table 4 about here

A two-factor Analysis of Variance for sex of participant by subscale yeielded a significant main effect due to scale (F (1, 54 = 21.33, $p < .001$). A follow-up Newman-Keuls indicated that moral judgment scores from the child's perspective (self) were significantly higher than those from the perspective of mother or father ($p < .01$) (Table 5). Scores from the perspective of father were also significantly higher than from the perspective of mother ($p = .05$). No significant differences were observed between sexes.

Insert Table 5 about here

Parent Identification and Moral Judgment.--Parent identification scores were used to divide subjects into three groups: High Father identification, defined as scores below the (negative) mean father identification score (13 males, 2 females); High Mother identification, defined as scores above the (positive) mean Mother identification score (4 males, 15 females); and neutral scores falling between

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviation Scores for

Moral Judgment from Self, Father, and Mother Perspectives

and Total Across All Three Perspectives

	Self	Father	Mother	Total
Males $\bar{X}$	2.15	1.90	1.93	1.99
S.D.	.92	.97	.10	.97
Females $\bar{X}$	2.00	1.97	1.86	1.94
S.D.	.94	.96	.10	.97
Across				
Sex $\bar{X}$	2.06	1.94	1.89	1.96
S.D.	.94	.96	.10	.97

Table 5

Newman-Keuls Test

Moral Judgment Scores

	Perspectives		
	Mother 1.89	Father 1.94	Self 2.06
Mother 1.89		.044*	.169**
Father 1.94			.125**
Self 2.06			

*p = .05

**p < .01

those two points (7 males, 19 females). Moral Judgment scores for those three groups are presented in Table 6.

Insert Table 6 about here

An analysis of variance on moral judgment scores yielded no significant main effect of parent identification, or interaction. However, it is interesting to note that the means are in the expected direction. High Father identification scores were consistently larger than other scores, and High Mother, Mother's perspective yielded the lowest moral judgment score.

Discussion

The primary question posed by this study was whether there are sex differences in moral judgment in young children. The results yielded no significant effect of sex on moral judgment at this age level. This contradicts previous studies, some of which have indicated male subjects perform better than female subjects in measures of moral maturity, and some of which have reported superior performance for females. There are several possible explanations for this discrepancy.

As Turiel (1976) and Holstein (1976) noted, when socioeconomic level and type of school (progressive, conservative, or parochial) were controlled for, sex differences were eliminated. All subjects in the present study attended traditional public schools and represented the same general socioeconomic level and neighborhood.

Table 6

Moral Judgment Scores for Three Levels of Parent Identification

	Moral Judgment Perspectives			
	Self	Father	Mother	Total
Father Identified	4.33	4.00	3.93	12.27
Mother Identified	4.00	3.84	3.58	11.42
Neutral Identified	3.96	3.69	3.69	11.35

The use of Piaget's test of moral maturity may have reduced the impact of sex differences because it has a restricted range of scores. Perhaps a test offering a wider set of alternatives or a larger number of questions would have allowed greater discriminability.

Finally, the age range selected for this study may be too early. Children at the third grade level are on the verge of stage transition from a predominantly heteronomous orientation to a predominantly autonomous orientation. At this age, role taking skills are also developing from an egocentric perspective to a more reciprocal role taking perspective. Role taking in peer situations now becomes crucial for advanced moral judgment. These same role taking experiences will continue to define the child's sex role. It may be that as moral judgment becomes more dependent on role taking, reasoning would eventually come under the influence of differing sex role orientations. Measuring this relationship as it becomes more interdependent may necessitate the use of a more discriminative scale.

Findings reported in the literature of stronger sex role identification for males were confirmed here. The Draw-A-Child scale which yields a measure of strength of sex role identification, yielded significantly higher scores for males than for females. The fact that Draw-A-Child scores were higher than either Draw-A-Man or Draw-A-Woman indicates that subjects at

this age are still operating from an egocentric cognitive perspective. In addition, this fluctuation across the three scales, was more marked for male subjects, suggesting a more specific differentiation in sex role orientation for them. The similar scores across the three scales for female subjects may indicate the development of a more generalized "people" social perspective.

Although the results indicate differentiating sex role orientations at this age, the relationship of sex role identification to moral judgment was not significant. Two explanations can be offered for this finding. It may be that no relationship was observed in this study because sex role identification has not yet been fully incorporated by age nine. More plausibly, Piaget's scale may not be able to discriminate between instrumental and expressive orientations. This different orientation has been incorporated into Kohlberg's model at the Conventional Level. Kohlberg's Stage Three classification includes individuals who reason from an empathic "feelings" orientation while Stage Four individuals reason from an instrumental, law and order orientation.

Differences on the Parent Identification scale in the expected direction suggest that this test was a valid measure. Parent identification was clearly observed at this age. The relationship between father identification and moral judgment tended to support Fry, Johnson, and Freud. However, more subjects are needed to investigate the possible significance of this relationship. The sample was not

large enough to compare high father identified males and females or high mother identified males and females. It would appear to be useful to explore this relationship developmentally including earlier and later ages.

An interesting finding in the present study is the appearance of significantly higher moral judgment scores from the child's own perspective (self) than from the perspective of either father or mother with the lowest scores being from the perspective of mother. It is possible that children are aware of the intention/consequences discrepancy at a very early age. However, their good intention/high consequence acts are reacted to with greater anger especially by the mother who would more often be present when an accident occurs. These results suggest that the child perceives the mother at a "lower" level of moral judgment. The same finding was observed on the relationship between parent identification and moral judgment. The lowest mean score was for high mother identified subjects from the perspective of mother.

Further research is needed to explore the differences suggested in the present study, particularly the suggested relationship between parent identification and moral judgment. If there is a relationship between moral judgment and differing sex role orientations, it appears that only a developmental study utilizing a more discriminative scale will successfully clarify the issue. The study points to the possibility that sex differences as previously reported are due to factors other than "maleness" or "femaleness."

Reference Notes

1. Personal communication reported by M.F. Holland, Washington, D.C., September, 1981.

2. Moral Development: A Critique. Paper presented by Ruth Oakes at the Missouri Academy of Science, Social Science Symposium, April, 1976.

References

Arbuthnot, Jack. Modification of moral judgment through role playing. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11 (3), 319-324.

Armsby, Richard E. A reexamination of the development of moral judgments in children. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1241-1248.

Aronfreed, J. Conduct and Conscience: The Socialization of Internalized Control Over Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Bandura, A., Social-learning theory of identificatory processes, in D.A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Barry, H., Bacon, Margaret K., Child, E.L. A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 327-332.

Brown, Daniel G. Sex role development in a changing culture. Psychological Bulletin, 1958, 4, 238-242.

Bronfrenbrenner, Urie. Preudian theories of identification and their derivatives, Child Development, 1960, 31, 15-40.

Buchanan, J.P., Thompson, S.P. A quantitative methodology to examine the development of moral judgment, Child Development, 1973, 44, 186-189.

Bull, Norman J. Moral Education. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1969.

Buros, Oscar K. Goodenough-Harris, 352 and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test in Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Burton, Roger V. Assessment of Moral Training Programs. Paper presented to Division 7-Developmental Psychology section at the APA Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., September 1976.

Casey, William M. and Burton, Roger V. Moral Reasoning, Values and Honesty in Young Children, Paper presented at the APA Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., September 1976.

Chandler, M.J., Greenspan, M., and Barenboim C. Judgments of intentionality in response to videotaped and verbally presented moral dilemas: the medium is the message. Child Development, 1973, 44, 315-320.

Colley, Thomas. Nature and origins of psychological sexual identity. Psychological Review 66 (3), 1959.

Costanzo, P.R., Coie, J.D., Gromet, J.F., and Farnill, D. A re-examination of the effects of intent and consequences on children's moral judgments. Child Development, 1973, 44, 154-161.

Drozd, George J. and Zimmerman, Robert R. Moral Development as a Function of Age, Sex, and Story Content. Paper presented at EPA, April 1976.

Dunn, Lloyd M. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. American Guidance Services. Minn., Minn. 1959.

Durkin, Dolores. Sex differences in children's concepts of justice. Child Development, 1960, 31, 361-368.

Duska, Ronald, and Whelan, Mariellen. Moral Development: A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg. Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York, 1975.

Eisenberg-Berg, Nancy. The Development of Prosocial Moral Reasoning and Its Relationship to Kohlbergian, Prohibition-Oriented Moral Reasoning. Extended version of paper presented at SRCD, 1977.

Emmerich, Walter. Young children's discrimination of parent and child roles. Child Development, 1959, 30, 403-419.

Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: Norton Publishing Co., 1963.

Fauls, Lydia B., and Smith, W.D. Sex role learning of 5 year olds. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1956, 89, 105-117.

Feffer, Melvin, Developmental analysis of interpersonal behavior. Psychological Review, 1970, 77 (3), 197-214.

Finn, J.D. A General Model for Multivariate Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1974.

Flavell, John H. The Development of Role-taking and Communication Skills in Children. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley & Sons Inc. 1968.

Freud, S. Group psychology and the analysis of ego. In Sprachey, J. (Ed.) Standard Edition of the Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Vol. 18, London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

Freud, S. Some psychical consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes. In Sprachey, J. (Ed.) Standard Edition of the Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, rev. ed., Vol. 19, London: Hogarth Press, 1961.

Fry, P.S. Moral judgment and parental identification among children. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1975, 31 (3), 476-483.

Gollin, E.S. Forming impressions of personality. Journal of Personality, 1954, 25, 65-76.

Gray, Susan W. and Klaus, Rupert. The assessment of parental identification. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1956, 54, 87-114.

Gray, Susan W. Masculinity-feminity in relation to anxiety and social acceptance. Child Development, 1957, 28 (2) 203-214.

Harris, Dale B. Childrens Drawings as Measures of Intellectual Maturity: A Revision and Extension of Goodenough Draw-A-Man Test. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. 1963.

Harris, Stephen, Mussen, Paul, Rutherford, Eldred. Some cognitive behavioral and personality correlates of maturity of moral judgment. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 128, 123-135.

Hoffman, Martin L. Childbearing practices and moral development: Generalizations from empirical research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 295-318.

Hoffman, Martin L. Identification and conscience development. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1071-1082.

Hoffman, Martin L., and Levine, Laura E. Early sex differences in empathy. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, (6), 557-558.

Hoffman, Seymour. Intelligence and the development of moral judgment in children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1977, 130, 27-34.

Holstein, Constance Boucher. Irreversible stepwise sequence in the development of moral judgment: A longitudinal study of

males and females. Child Development, 1976, 47, 51-61.

Johnson, Miriam M. Sex role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 1963, 34, 319-333.

Kagan, J. The concept of identification. Psychological Review, 1958, 65, 296-305.

Kay, William. Moral Education--A Sociological Study of the Influence of Society, Home, and School. London, England: George Allen and Unwin Limited, 1975.

Keasey, Charles Blake. Young children's attribution of intentionality to themselves and others. Child Development, 1977, 48, 261-264.

Keasey, Charles Blake. Children's developing awareness of intentionality and motives. In C.B. Keasey, Ed., Nebraska Symposium on Motivation XXV, Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press. In press.

Kohlberg, L. The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years ten to sixteen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: the cognitive developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin, Ed., Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

LaVoie, Joseph. Cognitive determinants of resistance to deviation in 7, 9, and 11 year old children of low and high maturity of moral judgment. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10 (3), 393-403.

Lazowick, L. On the nature of identification. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 175-185.

Lickona, Thomas. Ed. Moral Development and Behavior: Theory Research and Social Issues. New York, N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Lynn, D.B. Sex and parent identification. Child Development, 1962, 33, 555-564.

Maccoby, E.A. and Jacklin, C.N. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Marsh, Diane T., and Serafica, Felicisima C. Perspective Taking and Moral Judgment: A Developmental Analysis. Longer version of a paper presented at SRCD, New Orleans, 1977.

Matefy, Robert E., and Acksen, Barbara A. The effects of role playing discrepant positions on change in moral judgments and attitudes. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 128, 189-200.

McCrae, Duncan Jr. A test of Piaget's theories of moral development. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 49, 14-18.

Mowrer, O. Hobart. Psychotherapy, Theory and Research. New York, N.Y.: The Ronald Press Co., 1953.

Mowrer, O. Hobart. Learning Theory and Personality Dynamics. New York, N.Y.: The Ronald Press, 1950.

Peck, Robert F. and Havighurst, Robert J. The Psychology of Character Development. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1960.

Poppen, P.J. Sex differences in moral judgment. Proceedings, Division of Personality and Social Psychology, APA, 1974, 313-315.

Rosenberg, B.G. and Sutton-Smith, B. The measurement of masculinity and femininity in children: an extension and revalidation. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1964, 104, 259-264.

Sears, Robert R. Preliminary report on a study of identification. The American Psychologist, 1953, 8, 431.

Sears, Robert R., Maccoby, Eleanor E., and Levin, Harry. Patterns of Child Rearing. White Plains, N.Y.: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1957.

Selman, Robert L. The relation of role taking to the development of moral judgment in children. Child Development, 1971, 42, 79-91.

Selman, Robert L. Taking another's perspective: role taking development in early childhood. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1721-1734.

Sutton-Smith, B. and Rosenberg, B.G. Development of sex differences in play choices during preadolescence. Child Development, 1963, 34, 119-126.

Turiel, Elliot. A comparative analysis of moral knowledge and moral judgment in males and females. Journal of Personality, 1976, 44 (2), 195-208.

Tyler, Leona E. The Psychology of Human Differences. New York, N.Y.: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.

Vikan, Arne. Moral judgment as a function of role-playing instructions. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 128, 109-121.

Vikan, Arne. Objective and subjective responsibility in moral judgment as a function of enactment of role polarities. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 128, 153-161.

Weisbroth, Stephanie. Moral judgment and parental identification. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2 (3), 396-402.

Whiteman, Martin. Children's conceptions of psychological causality as related subjective responsibility, conservation, and language. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 128, 215-226.

Whiteman, Paul H. and Kosier, Kenneth P. Development of children's moralistic judgments: age, sex, IQ, and certain experiential variables. Child Development, 1964, 35, 843-850.

Williams, Norman, and Williams, Sheila. The Moral Development of Children. London, England: MacMillan, Education Ltd., 1972.

Yussen, Steven R. Moral reasoning from the perspective of others. Child Development, 1976, 47, 551-555.